



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,972	07/05/2001	Sung Bum Cho	P-200	2470
34610	7590	04/01/2005	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			KNOWLIN, THJUAN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2642	

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/897,972

Applicant(s)

CHO, SUNG BUM

Examiner

Thjuan P Knowlin

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed on January 24, 2005 has been entered. Claims 1, 9, 15, 22, and 23 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. No claims have been added. Claims 1-24 are still pending in this application, with claims 1, 9, 15, 22, and 23 being independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Svennesson et al (US 6,005,845), in view of Blumenschein et al (US 6,687,337).
3. In regards to claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 20, 22, 23, and 24, Svennesson discloses a method and system of providing a conference call supplemental service in an intelligent network (col. 10 lines 11-21 and col. 11 lines 25-38), comprising: analyzing a call and driving a conference calling service logic program at a Service Control Point (SCP 201 and SCP 901) of a communication network (col. 6 lines 1-20); performing an intelligent network basic call processing function at a Service Switch Point (SSP 204

and SSP 205) of the communication network (col. 7 lines 26-46 and col. 7 lines 55-67); establishing a temporary connection between the SCP and an intelligent peripheral (col. 6 lines 15-20, col. 6-7 lines 60-2, and col. 12-13 lines 59-2). Svennesson, however, does not disclose setting a direct route between the SSP and the IP; and announcing the service to a subscriber using the direct route between the SSP and IP without using the SCP to announce the service, and collecting and processing subscriber information. Blumenschein, however, does disclose setting a direct route (See Fig. 2) between the SSP (SSP 54) and the IP (SN/IP 56); and announcing the service to a subscriber using the direct route between the SSP and IP without using the SCP to announce the service, and collecting and processing subscriber information (col. 6 lines 22-26 and col. 6 lines 37-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ these features within the method and system, as a way of providing services to a subscriber through a direct route between the SSP and IP, therefore, not requiring the SCP to announce the service. These features would provide voice functions using an intelligent peripheral that is specific to the intelligent network.

4. In regards to claims 5 and 18, Svennesson discloses the method and system, wherein establishing the temporary connection between the SCP and IP comprises sending a request message from a Service Control Function of the SCP to a Service Switch Function of the SSP (col. 6 lines 15-20, col. 6-7 lines 60-2, col. 7 lines 55-67, and col. 12-13 lines 59-2).

Art Unit: 2642

5. In regards to claims 6, 10, 17, and 19, Svennesson discloses the method and system, wherein setting the route between the SSP and the IP comprises sending an initial address message from a Service Switch Function of the SSP to a Specialized Resource Function of the IP, and sending an address complete message from the SRF to the SSF (col. 8 lines 24-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 3, 4, 8, 13, 14, 16, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Svennesson et al (US 6,005,845) and Blumenschein et al (US 6,687,337), in view of Eaton et al (US 5,483,588).

7. Svennesson and Blumenschein disclose all of claims 2, 3, 4, and 16 limitations, except the method and system, further comprising dialing a service code by a requesting subscriber, translating the dialed code by an originating station, and routing the code to a Service Switch Function of the SSP with numbers of subscribers who will participate in the conference call to initiate the conference calling service. Eaton, however, discloses the method and system, further comprising dialing a service code by a requesting subscriber, translating the dialed code by an originating station, and routing the code to a Service Switch Function of the SSP with numbers of subscribers

Art Unit: 2642

who will participate in the conference call to initiate the conference calling service (col. 8 lines 39-56, col. 9 lines 28-42, and col. 10 lines 17-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate dialing a service code by a requesting subscriber, into the system, as a way of verifying the authorization of a requesting subscriber and using that authorization to establish a conference calling service.

8. Svennesson and Blumenschein disclose all of claims 8, 13, 14, and 21 limitations, except the method and system, further comprising: instructing a Specialized Resource Function of the IP to record the conference call by delivering a play and receive message from a Service Control Function of the SCP to the SRF; recording the conference call by the SRF; sending the record of the conference call from the SRF to the SCF; and storing the received record at the SRF. Eaton, however, discloses the method and system, further comprising; instructing a system to record the conference call by delivering a play and receive message; recording the conference call; sending the record of the conference call; and storing the received record (col. 15 lines 54-65).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion


10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Blumenschein et al (US 6,424,702) teach a method and system for termination blocking of message delivery service.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thjuan P Knowlin whose telephone number is (571) 272-7486. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00pm.

12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar can be reached on (571) 272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thjuan P. Knowlin


AHMAD F. MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700